for External Affairs. Between India and the EEC, has there been any discussion on this question of terrorists? Would the honourable Minister explain whether collectively, as it is, or bilaterally, between individual countries, that is, between India and the EEC or between India and the various constituent countries of the EEC, is there an accepted definition of terrorism? Is there a common understanding on who a terrorist is and what terrorism is? I am asking this because unless that base is there, I do not think the talks would be of any great use. Would the honourable Minister of State, therefore, clarify whether there is an accepted definition of terrorism?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I do not know what the specific definition is. But I do know that at the UN and in the Commonwealth and in the NAM and in the SAARC, we have...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not asking about the UN or the NAM or the SAARC. The question is specifically about the EEC, about the accepted definition between the constituent countries. Do they accept what we mean by terrorism? Is there a commonly understood definition of terrorism?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I appreciate what the honourable Member has said and I appreciate his feel for the language and this desire for precision. If we are going to waste a great deal of time in defining what terrorism is or who a terrorist is, then I think the international organisations can go on like this till kingdom comes. But the fact is that there is a threat and we discuss this. So far nobody in the world has questioned who a terrorist is. Legally we can argue about it, argue about what terrorism is. But everybody knows what it means. If there is a question from the EEC we will certainly sit down and discuss with them. I do not think the definition of terrorism should delay the action on a bilateral or multilateral level to deal with this problem; I do not think that is an important issue.

श्रीमती शान्ति पहाड़िया : श्रीमन्, मैं मंत्री जी से एक बात पूछना चाहती हूं कि हमारे राजस्थान के गंगानगर में मैंने सुना कि काफी तादाद में आतंकवादियों को हथियार सप्लाई होते हैं। तो क्या आप इसकी जांच कराएंगे ?

श्री के० नटवर सिंह : महोदया, यह सवाल तो आप गृह मंत्रालय के सामने पेश कीजिए। मेरा सवाल तो ई०ई०सी० और हिन्दुस्तान का है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 42.

**US Plan to upgrade Pak armed forces**

*42. SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA:

SHRI KAPIL VERMA:†

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of documents furnished recently to the U.S. Congress by the U.S. Defence Department unveiling a massive plan to upgrade Pakistan's armed forces; if so, what is Government's reaction thereto; and

(b) whether the issue has been taken up with the U.S. Government; if so, what is the response thereto?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): (a) and (b) In recent testimony in the U.S. Congress, U.S. officials have reiterated the commitment of the U.S. Government to assist in the modernization of Pakistan's armed force. A major portion of the U.S. aid package of U.S. $4.02 billion for

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Kapil Verma.

1987—92 is intended for this purpose. On a number of occasions, the Government of India has expressed concern over the supply of sophisticated armaments and defence technologies to Pakistan.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Sir, as the newspaper reports show, it has been stated in the US Congress while presenting the package that one of the objectives of the aid package is to provide incentive to Pakistan to be more responsive to the US goals of nuclear non-proliferation. But, as you know, Sir, Pakistan is going ahead with its nuclear programme. And even our Prime Minister has pointed out that Pakistan is very close to the bomb and its programme is military-oriented. So I want to know from the Government what is its information, what stage Pakistan has reached actually about this bomb, what we are doing about this and what was the reply of the US Government when it was pointed out them that Pakistan is going ahead with nuclear weapons programme. It does not merit, according to its own laws, any aid.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the question concerns conventional arms. But I have this information to offer to the hon. Member. The reaction or the response of the US authorities is—and I quote:

> "We believe that neither India nor Pakistan has irrevocably crossed the nuclear threshold by deciding to acquire the nuclear arsenal, and we believe both Governments desire to avoid a nuclear arms race."

This is what they have said. Now, we do not necessarily agree with this. But this does not fall within the scope of this particular question. Tomorrow we are going to discuss external affairs; if the point is raised I would be prepared to give more information.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: While presenting the package it was stated in the US Congress one of the main objectives is to prevent Pakistan from going nuclear. But our own Prime Minister says: no, they are going ahead with it. So I would like the Government to tell us what is the information.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the US authorities have been adducing several arguments from time to time to justify their aid package to Pakistan. One of the argument is what the hon. Member has just said. On that specific point they have themselves said that they do not believe that Pakistan has crossed the threshold. We do not agree with them. But the point is that it is their perception. And, therefore, on that question there is nothing more we can say. We do not agree. We think that from their own sources, from their own information, information which has been called out from different sources in U.S. itself, their assessment does not appear to be very accurate. But even so, we have brought this to their notice and we will continue to bring this to their notice. This is the position.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Second supplementary. The testimony in the US Congress while asking for the Package stated that the U.S. Government—I have got a cutting with me—is considering supply of 60 more F-16 fighters, Abram tanks, which are quite dangerous, and 8 frigates. I am not talking about missiles just now. But we have learnt in this House and from newspapers also that our Ambassador has met the authorities in America and at other levels also the U.S. has been approached and told about our apprehension about F-16 fighters because these in fact can deliver nuclear bombs. So we have requested them. They assured us that, no, they have not taken any decision. Now they say that they are going to do it. So, I want the Government to tell us what exactly has happened and what was their response when we approached them. What is the information about U.S. intentions?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, their responses have been as follows:

(1) Administration had only included systems in which Pakistan had shown interest and upon which agreement was envisaged;

(2) Most of the weapon systems said to be eligible for approval for Pakistan this year represented additional quantities of systems already sold and in the Pakistani military inventories—artillery, radar, helicopters, etc.; and

(3) It was the continuation of the overall modernisation programme with an aircraft already in the Pakistani inventory and did not represent new technology or capability."

In general, they have made a statement to this effect:

"U.S. would be responsive to requests from Pakistan to meet her legitimate defence requirements to strengthen their confidence in their conventional defensive capabilities and (This is important.) U.S. would avoid selling weapon systems which would introduce new technologies into the sub-continent thereby upsetting stability in the region."

These are the categorical statements that have come from the U.S. Administration. It remains to be seen what exactly will happen in conformity with this or may be otherwise. Sir, they have said that the demand or the proposal to supply F-16s that is under consideration is reasonable and fully justified. From our point of view, we do not agree with this assessment. We have told them that even more of the same, i.e. larger numbers of F-16s which are already in their inventory, the sheer numbers create a dimension by themselves and that creates difficulties in the security environment in this area. This is what we have categorically told them.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: What about Abram tanks and frigates?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I could not go into individual items. If the member wants, I can give him the reply on individual items. This is roundly what they have said. In fact, we should be interested in pinning them down to this that they are not going to escalate the level of sophistication in this area. I do not want to comment on it one way or the other just at this moment. I just wanted the House to know that this is what they have said.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir, there is another aspect of the matter also. It is true that the U.S. Government is continuously supplying the Pakistani Army with modern weapons. It is not only that. After the conflict has broken between Afghanistan and the rebels, the U.S. Government is supplying modern arms and equipment to the rebels based in Pakistan for launching attack on Afghanistan territories. Sir, my hunch is that many of the arms they have been supplied to the rebels by the U.S. Government and also by the Pakistani Government may find their way into India ultimately and they can be used by the Indian terrorists also. Has the Government considered this aspect of the matter and taken up the issue with the appropriate authorities in the USA and Pakistan?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes, Sir. We have considered this issue. We have brought this forcefully to their notice. About Afghanistan, as the hon. Members are aware, there was a time when the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan was adduced as an additional important point for arming Pakistan. Now, when the Soviet troops are out, that point is not being stressed. What is being stressed is the general commitment for the modernisation of the Armed Forces of Pakistan. That happens to be the case. We have told

them, in addition, that at this point of time when the relations between India and Pakistan are likely to improve and the atmosphere is very congenial, this will be a setback in our relations, particularly when on our side we have voluntarily announced some reduction in our defence expenditure. These are the two new aspects which need to be taken into account. All the other arguments have been adduced before. But these two are the latest developments and these are positive developments. Any induction of a large number of sophisticated arms, whether they are in the inventory of Pakistan or not, is likely to vitiate the atmosphere. This is what we have told them in our demarche.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I know from the hon. Minister as to what are the various political and diplomatic measures undertaken by the Government of India to convince the United States of America and other western countries that Pakistan is unnecessarily creating these armed forces causing unnecessary out of proportion uneasiness in the region and what has been the succees of the measures taken so far?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, we have been doing it for a long time. I have already informed the House about the responses which we got from the other side. The responses are not at all positive. They are going ahead with their commitment or whatever they might call it. The point is that where we do not succeed in convincing them, the obvious thing to do is to see that our own preparedness is at the level at which it ought to be. That is all.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: The question is what measures you have taken, what various steps you have taken, diplomatic or political, to convince them. This is our positive action.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, what I have just submitted are only diplomatic measures, quite forceful measures. About the other measures, I cannot think of any other measures except being prepared ourselves. That is all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Subramanian Swamy.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: You called me, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so. Are you Subramanian Swamy?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Yeah. (*Interruptions*) Sir, he wants me not to talk about Karnataka. All right. I will talk about something else. (*Interruptions*) Now the Communists are getting excited. I am not talking about the Soviet Union. So, don't worry. (*Interruption*) You are all getting telephone calls and you will find out.

Sir, the Minister has just said that we have voluntarily cut down our Defence budget to send a signal of wanting to seek friendship with Pakistan. Of course, this kind of a signal will harm the country and it is an appeasement. What I would like to know from the Minister is whether the non-scheduling of the 'Agni', IRBM missile, is also a signal to America and Pakistan, another form of appeasement, and that is why it has been withheld from being fired.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: You should ask Mr. K. C. Pant. (Interruptions).

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: He said that we sent a signal by cutting our Defence budget...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I never said...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: They have stopped 'Agni' missile firing. This is, of course, a signal. You say yes or no.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I did not say that this is a signal to anyone. I only said, in a new atmosphere we voluntarily did it as is evident from the Budget figures. This is for this year. Now we have to see how the atmosphere really improves

and develops in the coming months. That is all there is to it. Sir, about 'Agni', I have nothing to say. It is going to be launched. According to our information, it is only a postponement.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he is aware that in the efforts of Pakistan to continue to get closer to making the bomb—and he says the Indian perception is different from the US perception—enriched uranium has been smuggled even from India to Pakistan through various sources as a part of this effort.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I would like to confine my attention to the question. And this has nothing to do with the nuclear aspect. Tomorrow, in the discussion, if these points are raised, I am prepared to answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 43.

**Study of Visakhapatnam Port by Maritime Research Institute of Netherlands**

*43. SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to major ports in the country?

(a) whether the Maritime Research Institute (Marine) of the Netherlands is undertaking a study of Visakhapatnam Port to improve its capability; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof and whether similar sutdies would also be undertaken for other major ports in the country?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT AND THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. NAMAYAL): (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

**Statement**

**Study of Visakhapatnam Port by maritime Research Institute of Netherlands**

(a) and (b) Under the Indo-Dutch Bilateral Programme, the Maritime Research Institute (MARIN) of Netherlands has been entrusted with a study on feasibility of piloting vessels longer than 193.54 metres and having beams wider than 30.48 metres from the inner harbour to the outer harbour in Visakhapatnam Port. This study is specific to the Visakhapatnam port.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Sir, to my question the answer given by the Minister is that under the Indo-Dutch Bilateral Programme, the Maritime Research Institute of Netherlands has been entrusted with a study of feasibility of piloting vessels longer than 193.54 metres and having beams wider than 30.48 metres from the inner harbour to the outer harbour in Visakhapatnam Port. I would like to know from the Minister when this work has been entrusted to this research institute how much time it will take to complete this study and I would also like to know from the Minister whether under this bilateral programme any other programme has also been undertaken between these two countries.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the Visakhapatnam Port the shipyard is close to the port and this is where we have to seek the support of the Dutch. At the moment, we are building ships of round about 42,000 DWT. But our shipyard capacity is also being enhanced and we are likely to build ships up to 70,000 or 80,000 DWT, the biger ships in size. So, we have asked this country to help us to give us their techniques where and what to be done so that larger ships could be handled in that corridor of the channel. So, these details were discussed with them in June 1988 we